



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

text critical notes are at the end. Some of the parts (e.g. *Joma* and *Middot*) have long introductions.

The enterprise is not the first of its kind: Professor Hermann Strack has published, with his well-known accuracy, several parts of the Mishna in a revised text with critical and explanatory notes, some of them accompanied by translations; an edition of the whole Mishna, with German translation and commentary, has been in slow progress for many years under the hands of several Jewish scholars, and is still remote from completion.

The different tracts of Beer and Holtzmann's edition vary considerably in execution; some of them have been subjected to rather severe criticism on the philological side—not all of it with a solely philological animus. Certainly it cannot be claimed for them that they have great scientific value for the interpretation of the Mishna—though the title-page seems to profess something of the kind. They are essentially school-books, and there is about some of them a perceptibly amateurish air; but their shortcomings are not such as seriously to impair their usefulness for the readers for whom they are designed.

The publisher has done his part well; the typography is excellent, and the paper sufficiently opaque.

GEORGE F. MOORE.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

THE THEOLOGY OF THE GOSPELS. JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., D.Litt. (Studies in Theology.) Charles Scribner's Sons. 1913. Pp. xii, 220. 75 cents.

The aim of this book is thus defined in its preface: "What these pages attempt to do is to present a study of the central and salient features in the theology of the Gospels, taking theology in its stricter rather than in its wider sense." The assumption that the Gospels contain a theology is defended by insisting that "the most elementary and spontaneous experience of the Christian religion, then as now, involved what may be called without inaccuracy dogmatic or theological conceptions."

This means that these conceptions are to be found in the Gospels. "Because they mirror an experience which tends to become conscious of its issues in history and nature, . . . they are Gospels." These theological ideas which belong to an intelligent experience are assumed to be a self-consistent product; there is a theology of the Gospels. To be sure, this theology is, so far as the first three Gospels are concerned, "implicit rather than explicit," which perhaps means that these dogmatic conceptions are not affirmed, but

inferred from the religious utterances of their authors. Still, implicit or explicit, the theology is there. "There is a line of continuity between the first three Gospels and the fourth in point of their theology." There is "a theology of the Gospels."

Do the phenomena of these documents justify this assumption? Dr. Moffatt is too thorough and candid a New Testament scholar not to appreciate the difficulty which many of his readers will have in accepting it. Each of the three Synoptic Gospels presents its author's religious thought; that of the Fourth Gospel comes from a mind of great originality. The words of Jesus preserved in the Synoptics are those of a creative genius. Can we gather all the dogmatic or theological conceptions into a self-consistent whole, and call it a theology of the Gospels? Yes, says our author. At least so far as the "classic and fundamental elements" of Christianity" which it contains are concerned. Jesus, Mark, Matthew, Luke, John, give us one theology.

This thesis is wrought out in Dr. Moffatt's discussion of the Christology of the Gospels. There is no essential difference, it is urged, between the various conceptions of Christ. The latest is the earliest in a more developed form. "Jesus felt that he had a unique personal relation to the Father." "This is the primary factor of the Christology of the Gospels." "The Messianic consciousness is a modification of this." "To Mark Jesus is a heavenly being sent by God as his only and well-beloved son, to accomplish the purpose of his kingdom." "The birth-stories of Matthew and Luke are naïve attempts to express the Christian sense of what was implied in the unique filial consciousness of Jesus." In the Fourth Gospel Jesus' unique sonship is represented as a relation belonging to the divine nature. "His incarnation as the Logos is only a form of that eternal sonship which he enjoyed with the Father as an essential relation with his nature." He is specifically related to the Father as a divine being akin to God in nature and at the same time dependent on Him. "It is the recognition of this filial consciousness of Jesus as the crucial element in the Synoptic Christology which really enables us to understand the continuity between the first three Gospels and the Fourth. . . . When the filial consciousness of Jesus is seen to be prior to the Messianic, the starting-point for the special Christology of the Fourth Gospel is at once gained."

If Dr. Moffatt means by this that the Johannine Christology is, to use his own word, "implicit" in the filial consciousness of Jesus, he makes an assertion which many candid readers of the Gospels will be unable to accept. They will insist that this is not the only

interpretation of that consciousness which preserves its religious value, and explains Jesus' teaching and acts. That Jesus was the Eternal Son of God incarnate is surely a "theological, or dogmatic conception." That this conception was entertained by him, Dr. Moffatt does not undertake to show. He assumes that one who appreciates Jesus' thought of himself, so far as known, will think of him in this way.

The reviewer would ask, why assume this? He ventures the criticism that the unsupported assumption is a serious defect in a book professedly giving results drawn from facts by historical methods. Dr. Moffatt, to be sure, insists that study of the Gospels must be pursued in a religious spirit to find the theology in them, and that this spirit is one of subjection to Jesus Christ. "Before we can safely reason from the Gospels, we have to share their position towards the great personality behind and above them."

But even one who occupies this position is not able to find all the truth he needs without using his mind. He can "safely reason," and he must reason to get conclusions. And if he present what profess to be conclusions drawn from facts, he may properly be asked to show that they are drawn by valid inference.

The thesis of the book then, that the Gospels hold a "theology in the stricter, rather than the wider sense," has not, in the opinion of the reviewer, been made good. One lays down the book feeling that its title stands for an unverified assumption.

But this criticism must not be understood to imply that the book is without interest and value. On the contrary, its author's acquaintance with recent Gospel criticism, and his endeavor to present the thought of the Gospels in the light of that criticism, make it suggestive and stimulating. Dr. Moffatt deals with topics of criticism in a candid spirit. His discussion of problems of interpretation, such as the eschatology of Jesus, or Jesus' self-designation—"Son of man"—is able. The ease of the author's expression makes the book attractive. The obscurity which one now and then finds in a sentence may perhaps be attributed to the compression required by the character of the series to which the book belongs. Its value is enhanced by a bibliography, a general index, and an index of the Scriptural quotations.

EDWARD Y. HINCKS.